

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/658,564	09/08/2003	Ammon B. Peck	UF-145C4D2	3383	
23557 7	590 05/18/2006		EXAMINER		
	HIK LLOYD & SALI DNAL ASSOCIATION	MUMMERT, STEPHANIE KANE			
PO BOX 1429		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			1637		

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/658	10/658,564 F		PECK ET AL.			
		Examin	er	Art Unit	T			
			ie K. Mummert	1637				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appears on t	he cover sheet with	the correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Externafter - If NC - Failur Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MINISTRICT IN THE MINISTRICT IN THE MINISTRICT IN THE MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nunication. atutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICA event, however, may a reply will expire SIX (6) MONTHS pplication to become ABANI	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on .						
-	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)□	Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> are subject to restriction	on and/or election r	equirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any object	ction to the drawing(s	be held in abeyance.	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		` '			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. I	Note the attached O	office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)[a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
			• •		d Ctoro			
	3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internatio	• •		ceived in this Nationa	i Stage			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action			ceived.				
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			mary (PTO-413)				
2) Motic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or	TO-948) PTO/SB/08)	_	fail Date mal Patent Application (P1	ГО-152)			
	r No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:	.,	•			

Application/Control Number: 10/658,564 Page 2

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-10, 12-17, drawn to polynucleotide(s) encoding polypeptides, vector(s) and host cell(s), classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- II. Claim 11, drawn to a method of detection, classified in class 435, subclass 6.The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
- 2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the polynucleotide probes, primers and/or vectors that encode all or a portion of n oxalyl-CoA decarboxylase polypeptide can be used in methods of site-directed mutagenesis, in amplification, in sequencing, or in SNP genotyping, for example. The polynucleotide(s) represented by group I can be used in many ways that are separate and distinct from methods of detection of Oxalobacter formigenes bacteria in a sample. A search of the polynucleotide(s) represented by group I would not address the method of detection of group II and a search of the method is not required for a search of the polynucleotide(s) of group I. Therefore, in order to fully search both of these inventions together would require separate and distinct searches of the prior art using different search terms and databases for each group.

Art Unit: 1637

Because both invention(s) require distinct searches, it would pose an undue burden on the examiner to require a search of both inventions together.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected

Application/Control Number: 10/658,564

Art Unit: 1637

process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 4

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the 6. inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Application/Control Number: 10/658,564

Art Unit: 1637

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephanie K. Mummert whose telephone number is 571-272-8503. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Stephanie K Munt

Stephanie K Mummert

Examiner Art Unit 1637

SKM

JEFFREY FREDMAN

Page 5